The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 9
No. 5

SEPTEMBER
1916

ANOTHER ANSWER TO THE ONLY (?) SUFFRAGE ARGUMENT

NON-PARTISANSHIP

THE WOMAN'S PARTY AND THE NATIONAL AMENDMENT

THE PROBLEM THAT CONFRONTS US

RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO RULE

A CALIFORNIA EDITOR ON SUFFRAGE "TESTIMONY"

THE SUFFRAGE FIGHT FOR FEDERAL ACTION

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE DEBATES

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WOMAN'S HOME DIVISION

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore Md.

Mrs. A. J. George, Executive Secretary, Congressional Committee.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. David A. Reinhardt.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Treasurer, Miss Alys Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Puller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Water D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines.
President, Mrs. Simon Cassady.
Secretary, Mrs. Harry Phillips.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Rollins.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street, Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. E. G. Abbott.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman, Membership Committee, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 611 Roland Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. S. Reed Anthony.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Walter Richardson.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
First Vice-President, Mrs. N. C. Frick.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 804 Neave Building, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherfoord.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1583 Quarrier Street, Charleston.
Honorary President, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

ANOTHER ANSWER TO THE ONLY (?) SUFFRAGE ARGUMENT

By Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge

THE following statement, made by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, at the Mississippi Valley Suffrage Conference last May, is now being circulated as plate matter by the suffragists in the campaign States:

"The liquor interests and a certain sort of big business torpedoed women suffrage in the Eastern States by submarine attacks.

"Tons of literature of a scurrilous nature, bearing no imprint but emanating from the saloons, appeared from the invisible, unknown enemy of woman suffrage during the campaign in New York. The attack was of the submarine variety. Decent people, except the few conservatives, don't attack woman suffrage.

"Decent business doesn't attack suffrage, but there is a certain sort of big business which isn't decent which does fight us. This exists. We found it in the East, although we had known it previously in the West. We drove it out into the open in the East. After the campaign it went down, disappeared, but it will bob up during the next campaign.

"They have been able to hire some women who are reactionaries. The antis seem to be in the open while they are on the stage. I don't say that there is necessarily any connection between them and the submarine business enemies of suffrage.

"You doubtless are aware that some of the wholesale dealers who do business with the saloons, the men who sell glasses and equipment, contribute to a fund which is used against suffrage.

"(A saloon man honestly can say he did not contribute to the anti-suffrage cause. He didn't directly, but his money was got through this association.) If you want to know how much it amounts to multiply three-quarters of 8,000 saloons in a single city by $50 and you will get an idea of what the fund is for the country."

An Absurd Attack

Anti-suffragists have paid no attention to this attack until now, believing it too wild and absurd on its face to impress anybody or to require an answer. Now that it is being circulated as a campaign document, however, it must be pointed out that the entire tirade is as absurd as that part of it in which Mrs. Catt claims—without producing evidence or samples—that "tons of literature of a scurrilous nature, bearing no imprint but emanating from the saloons" were circulated; that an indecent opposition was driven "out into the open in the East," but has "disappeared" and is now "invisible and unknown." Couldn't the suffragists see it and know it while they had it "out in the open"?

The attack cannot be sustained in any particular. It is as baseless as the attempt to convey the false idea that there are numerous "single cities" with 8,000 saloons, three-quarters of which are contributing $50 each toward the defeat of woman suffrage by indirect methods.

The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage spent $32,548 for meetings, speeches, organization, literature, salaries and paid advertising in the last campaign.

Did You Get a Dollar's Worth?

Greater New York is the only city in the country with 8,000 saloons, the only place where Mrs. Catt's figures have any application. According to her statement, New York City saloonkeepers spent the sum of $300,000 on "scurrilous literature"—enough to send nearly *every anti-suffrage voter* in the city *a dollar's worth*. They were driven "out into the open" by the suffragists; and yet *not one of these men* has been indicted or convicted under the corrupt practices act, one of the best in America.

Moreover, the voters were picked so unerringly—according to this dream—that no *suffrage* voter got a dollar's worth (or even ten cents' worth) of the tons of "scurrilous literature" *to produce in court as evidence!*

Another Attempt

The first vice-president of the National Suffrage Association has taken advantage of the recent proposal for a *Federal* corrupt practices act as an occasion to *revive* this ancient, persistent, unwarranted and unjust attack on the anti-suffragists.

She says:

"We have found time and again, in our State fights, that large sums of money were being poured out to defeat us. Sometimes we could trace these streams to their source, usually finding some corrupt influence. Other times we could not.

"This corrupt practices act should make it possible for us always to know who was opposing us, if the law was enforced, and ofttimes that knowledge would create such reaction among the voters that it would do our cause great good."

The Only Organized Opposition

This is a broadcast charge directed against and intended to apply to the organized opposition to woman suffrage, composed of the National and State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage and the several Men's Leagues co-operating with them. This is the *only* opposition to woman suffrage in the United States which hires halls, holds meetings, engages speakers, writers, organizers and workers, to defeat woman suffrage.

This is the *only opposition* to woman suffrage waging an organized political campaign; the *only opposition* which files its reports with the Secretary of State wherever required, and the *only opposition* to which a corrupt practices act applies. This is the opposition, however veiled the wording, at which the suffragists aim every attack.

This opposition is *open and public*, and depends for its success entirely upon its ability to spread its platform and its principles among the voters by educational methods. This it has done so successfully in recent years, that the suffragists constantly refuse to meet its representatives in debate, and have apparently abandoned hopes of overcoming it in a *fair* fight at the polls.

Anti-Suffrage Funds

There has not been one election where suffragists have traced one dollar of the money expended by these organizations to any "corrupt influence." Our funds are raised entirely by voluntary subscriptions from women and men representing the highest ideals of citizenship.

These funds are small, averaging perhaps less than one-tenth the amount expended in favor of woman suffrage.

In 1914 the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage spent $17,000 in seven State campaigns. In 1915 the National Association spent $12,000 in the four Eastern States. The State Associations have also spent comparatively small amounts, the highest expenditures being in New York and Massachusetts, where full lists of the contributors and of the funds used are on file with the Secretary of State and are available to anyone who wishes to see them. We have no big campaign funds. We welcome corrupt practices acts. Massachusetts, with the best corrupt practices act in America, defeated woman suffrage in nearly every town and village.

Sworn Statements

The president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has denied under oath that any of this money comes from liquor or brewery interests. The executive officers of every State Anti-Suffrage Association have issued affidavits or detailed statements containing similar denials.

We absolutely repudiate, under oath, any connection or alliance with liquor or vicious interests. Their attitude on woman suffrage, whatever it may be, is of no interest or consequence to us. It is absurd to claim, as the suffragists do, even in prohibition States, that an interest which cannot win its own fight for its life can win our fight after it has been driven out of the State!

Come With Clean Hands

Moreover, suffragists should come to court with clean hands when they make these charges. They should be willing to swear that their own money is as clean as the anti-suffrage funds. We have challenged them for over a year to deny under oath—as we have done for our campaign funds—that they have ever asked for or received money from liquor interests.

Not one suffrage official has dared to accept this challenge. Not one suffrage society has condemned or repudiated the "liquor money" used and inherited by certain suffrage leaders.

An Appeal to the Public

The public should not allow anyone to "create reaction among the voters" to do their cause "great good" by means of unscrupulous attacks and unsubstantiated charges.

At the bar of public opinion, the anti-suffragists submit that this system is unjust, unfair and un-American.

The motives and character of the women and men who support the organized opposition to woman suffrage are as good as those of the suffragists.

Stop attacking our motives and characters—answer our arguments!

If the suffragists believe that "corrupt influences" are working against them, let them tell the public how these influences are working.

Are They Bribing the Voters?

If the "corrupt influences" hold no meetings, have no speakers and issue no respectable literature against woman suffrage, what are they doing against it? Are they actually bribing the voters at the polls?

Six million men have voted on this question in the last few years. The suffragists have not yet found one who will swear that he has been offered such a bribe. In many of the State campaigns suffragists have offered as high as $100 for the arrest and conviction of anyone casting an illegal vote against their cause. In sixteen State-wide campaigns they have not found evidence enough to indict one man!

If not one man in six million can be found by the suffragists who has been approached even by "corrupt influences" such opposition to woman suffrage may be regarded as highly hypothetical—a mythical movement so microscopic in its activities that no corrupt practices act would ever enable suffragists to discover it outside of their imaginations.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. IX September, 1916 No. 5

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

THE head of the organized suffragists in this country made a most extraordinary statement at the recent convention at Atlantic City, a statement that must antagonize both men and women and which sounds almost fanatical. She declared:

"Before the vote is won there must, and will be, a gigantic final conflict between the forces of progress, righteousness and democracy, the forces of ignorance, evil and reaction."

The implication is that all the forces of "progress, righteousness and democracy" are in favor of woman suffrage; that all those who are opposed belong to the forces of "ignorance, evil and reaction."

In our lists of those who are openly opposing woman suffrage are the names of dignitaries of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches; statesmen and honored leaders of both parties, and many of the most prominent educators. Among the women, leaders in all kinds of civic, municipal and philanthropic work are anti-suffragists. Must not these be counted with the forces of "progress and righteousness"?

As for democracy, "the first principle of a Republic is the law of majority rule," to quote Thomas Jefferson.

In twelve of the most important and populous States of the Union, the majority has voted against woman suffrage in no uncertain terms. In twenty-one other States, the majority in the Legislatures has defeated it. In the House of Representatives the majority was against it. Is it possible that all these majorities represent the forces of "ignorance, evil and reaction"?

The suffrage leader has struck the wrong note in her effort to win advocates for her cause. When she brands the majority of our citizens, among men and women, as ignorant, illiterate or evil, she does not appeal to the spirit of fair play inherent in American character.

NON-PARTISANSHIP

"WE believe that woman's non-partisanship is worth all our efforts to preserve; that the country's greatest need is united Americanism and that it would be a great misfortune to divide women into warring groups and factions, or to divide the interests of man and woman in good government by a 'woman's party' to oppose the opposite sex."

This statement appeared in the PROTEST in June. It has many times as much force now. In June anti-suffragists were one in their desire to keep out of State and national politics and to avoid allegiance with any party. At the present time many are tempted to make statements which are assumed to be against the interests of the Presidential candidate. Such statements are often construed in a partisan manner, regardless of the motives or intentions of the writer.

Shortly after Mr. Hughes made his statement in favor of a Federal amendment the leading PROTEST editorial last month, entitled, "Facts to be Squarely Met," was given to the press. Nothing in this statement expresses a partisan attitude. It is an examination of Mr. Hughes' views, and an assertion of other facts to be squarely met besides those mentioned by the candidate. Yet parts of this statement appeared in many papers after headings and a leading paragraph describing it as lining up the anti-suffragists against Mr. Hughes.

Another statement was issued by the President of the National Association, declaring that anti-suffragists would be asked to assist the candidates of *both parties* who have been "blacklisted" by the National American Woman Suffrage Association drawn forth by the declaration that the suffragists would oppose every man for Congress who said he would not vote for the Federal amendment. This statement, too, drew a partisan construction. "Anti-Suffragists Will Help Wilson" appeared in one paper as its heading, because, as one imaginative reporter wrote, "The anti-suffragists will help all 'blacklisted' candidates, and Mr. Wilson is the only Presidential candidate that suffragists oppose."

Even the PROTEST has been called partisan, because it devoted a good deal of space in its last issue to answering the arguments of Mr. Hughes on woman suffrage. One of our readers wrote: "You quoted nothing but radical Democratic papers against Mr. Hughes' stand. You quoted none of the Republican papers in favor of it."

We quoted on our first page every word Mr. Hughes said on suffrage at two meetings. We quoted a Democratic paper on the editorial page, not because it was Democratic, but because it was *pro-suffrage*, yet called the "Woman's Party" "the biggest undertaking in bossism ever proposed in this country." In a story from Washington regarding the President's attitude we quoted *five* Republican and *two* Democratic papers—all *pro-suffrage*. Each of these papers contained some fact not available in the others. We quoted several notable editorials against Mr. Hughes' suffrage stand. Why didn't we quote editorials in favor of it? For two very good reasons: first, this is an anti-suffrage magazine, and while willing to give any suffrage statement sufficient space to impress the reader with its full meaning and the arguments upon which it is based, we cannot be expected, after quoting such a statement in full, as Mr. Hughes' was, to quote just as many opinions in favor of it as against it. If we did that we would be publishing a suffrage debate, instead of an anti-suffrage magazine.

The second good reason for running no Republican editorials in praise of Mr. Hughes' attitude was because none was available. In Republican papers little or no editorial mention has been made of it. The Republicans, as a rule, have not considered his statement a vote-getter. No fair-minded person can criticize our quoting, under the circumstances, one of the most brilliant editorials ever written in defense of State rights, and several others pointing out with more or less emphasis that Mr. Hughes is in conflict with his party platform on this subject.

There are many persons who believe Mr. Hughes would make a good President, in spite of his suffrage views. They believe his suffrage views should not be held against him for that office; that his advocacy of a Federal amendment would no more insure its passage than President Wilson's stand for suffrage State by State has helped the suffragists in their State campaigns. This opinion is entitled to respect. Anti-suffragists, of all persons, are the last to imitate the principle of "suffrage first" and oppose a candidate only on the ground of his suffrage opinions.

There are persons who believe Mr. Hughes has shown "weakness" in dealing with the suffrage question. They claim that President Wilson has shown more strength. They fear Mr. Hughes would use the full power of the executive office to pass a Federal suffrage amendment and that the evils of woman suffrage would be upon us. With these persons, many of whom have voted the Republican ticket all their lives, the question of woman suffrage is of more importance than who shall be President for the next four years. They oppose Mr. Hughes on this ground. This opinion is also entitled to consideration and respect.

We might quote an entire issue of letters sent to us and to other papers by such persons—yet we have used none, simply because it has been our desire to run *nothing* prejudicial to the presidential chances of *either* candidate, no matter how much we disagree with him about woman suffrage, nor how much we may criticize the arguments upon which his *suffrage* opinions are based.

It is a duty to our readers to give them any facts that contrast with suffrage opinions, no matter how distinguished a person may hold these opinions. He alone is wholly responsible for their effect on his political fortunes, whatever it may be. This duty we shall continue to perform with dignity and fairness, always remembering that "Woman's non-partisanship is worth all our efforts to preserve," and pointing out in passing that women cannot get into any sort of politics without sacrificing a measure of their non-partisanship, "the incarnation of a purely disinterested idea appealing to universal humanity, irrespective of party or sect."

THE WOMAN'S PARTY AND THE NATIONAL AMENDMENT

A LIVELY debate took place in Congress on August 21, regarding the "Woman's Party" and Mr. Hughes' indorsement of the Federal suffrage amendment. We reproduce the salient points brought out by Senator Thomas, Democrat, of Colorado, and Senator Borah, Republican, of Idaho—both suffragists:

Mr. THOMAS: The Congressional Union, equipped with Mr. Hughes' approval and Colonel Roosevelt's benediction, met at Colorado Springs on schedule time and rechristened itself the Woman's Party. It stayed a moment's hesitation over its prearranged program and then took the plunge. This is its platform:

Whereas the present administration under President Wilson and the Democratic Party have persistently opposed the passage of a national suffrage amendment; and

Whereas each of the other national parties, either by their platform or through their candidates, are pledged to the passage of a Federal amendment enfranchising women: Therefore be it

Resolved, First, that the National Woman's Party, so long as the opposition of the Democratic Party continues, pledges itself to use its best efforts in the twelve States where women vote for President to defeat the Democratic candidate for President, and in the eleven States where women vote for members of Congress to defeat the candidates of the Democratic Party for Congress.

Resolved, Second, that we congratulate the Progressive, Prohibition and Socialist parties upon the definite stand which they have taken in their indorsement of suffrage for women by national action.

Resolved, Third, that we commend the position of the Republican candidate for President, Charles Evans Hughes, for the unequivocal stand which he has taken for human liberty by his indorsement of suffrage for women by national action, and assure him of our appreciation of his statesmanlike position.

The preamble begins and closes with a misstatement. The Democratic Party has not persistently or at all opposed the passage of the amendment. The President has done nothing about it, and properly so. The Republican Party has not persistently or otherwise advocated the passage of the amendment. Both parties have given little heed to the subject. The components of both differ broadly regarding it.

The preamble proceeds with the declaration that—

Each of the other parties, either by their platforms or through their candidates, are pledged to the passage of the amendment.

This is true only if a party nominee can by *fiat ex cathedra* change and reconstruct its official declarations as he may please. If he can do so, a party platform is worse than meaningless. It is a method of deception and changes with the view of the man whose confession of faith it is designed to be.

Has the Republican Party come to this? Has its committee or its membership accepted Mr. Hughes *ipse dixit* regarding the amendment or Colonel Roosevelt's assertion of its primary importance? Has a single Republican senator heretofore unfriendly to the amendment changed his attitude toward it because or since Mr. Hughes has done so? I challenge every one of them to answer this question affirmatively. (On the contrary, I have some reason to know that the pronouncement of Mr. Hughes has only served to stiffen the hostility of some of them, if, indeed, it has not aroused some resentment toward himself. And I am very sure that a similar announcement by the President would produce that effect on this side of the Chamber. And I suspect that were a vote taken upon the amendment to-day the ayes would be less than it would have commanded on the 31st of July.)

Mr. President, the amendment never had many friends on this floor, as the preceding one had in the last Congress. And the decrease is distributed upon both sides of the Chamber. I have it on good authority that the same is true of the House. With regard to Democratic defection, the reason is obvious. Some senators and representatives were opposed by the Congressional Union at the last election regardless of their suffrage views. It now proposes to defeat other Democrats who were suffragists before most of the union leaders were born. And all of them have good memories. They have political friends also. *The union complains bitterly of the non-action of the House Judiciary Committee regarding the amendment. Are they so ignorant of human nature that they cannot perceive the reason?*

[Italics ours.]

The Congressional Union also denounces Senate Democrats, because the amendment is still on the calendar. So far as I am aware, the only effort to secure its consideration outside of my own came from the national association. The officials of the union last June requested postponement of any action until they should request it, and the request has never been made, of me at least.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment in order to read the letter of Miss Anne H. Martin, legislative chairman, of date of 30th of June last, and addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage. The letter reads:

We understand that a meeting of senators from the suffrage States has been held, and that there has been some discussion of bringing the national suffrage amendment to a vote at an early date. The amendment is known as Senate joint resolution No. 1, and is Order No. 27 on the Senate calendar.

The Congressional Union is not yet ready for a vote on this amendment, and we write to ask you to oppose any effort which may be made for an early vote. We earnestly request that no move at all be made for a vote in the Senate without consultation with the Congressional Union on this subject.

Thanking you for your co-operation, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
ANNE H. MARTIN,
Legislative Chairman.

Mr. BORAH: Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to take the time of the Senate to inform it of my view and my position on the question of woman suffrage. I have been an advocate of woman suffrage for the last twenty-five years and am still a believer in the cause. I have been an opponent of the so-called Anthony amendment, and am still so, and expect to remain so until the close of my political career.

I am not going now to state the reasons why I am opposed to the Anthony amendment, because I have stated them on the floor of the Senate pretty fully heretofore, and they are well understood and in no sense are they modified by any present conditions or exigencies. But the senator from Colorado takes issue with Governor Hughes because, as he charges, he changed his platform or modified the platform or added to it by his individual expression of opinion. That certainly cannot be a subject matter of great moment to the Democrats in this campaign. It cannot be possible that our Democratic friends are going to criticize anyone for having expressed views contrary to the platform upon which he assumed to run. * * *

In my judgment Governor Hughes stands to lose more votes than he will gain, and that he acted from conviction.

But, Mr. President, the second charge against Mr. Hughes is that this was a matter of political expediency, and that is the view that seems to be entertained by the senator from New Jersey—that Mr. Hughes changed his mind because of the political expediency, or, rather, that he added to the platform because of political expediency. If that is an issue in this campaign, we can also meet that proposition by worthy precedents. Assuming for the sake of the argument that the senator is correct, are our Democratic friends in a position to urge that issue?

There is no one upon that side of the Chamber who speaks with more authority and with greater political acumen than the distinguished senior senator from Missouri [Mr. Stone]. Everyone knows that as a political leader he is exceedingly astute and close observer. He does not speak at random. After the plank had been adopted at St. Louis, Mr. Stone was interviewed on the matter, and he said:

I do not think the vote on the suffrage plank reflects the opinion of the delegates. They took the attitude that the men they had selected to draft the platform believed the plank was proper, and voted for it. It was a matter of political expediency.

There is the construction which was placed upon the platform adopted at St. Louis in a few minutes thereafter by a gentleman who had as much to do with the shaping of political affairs at St. Louis, perhaps, as any other one man, and I suspect more than any other one man. "It was adopted," said the distinguished senator, "as a matter of political expediency"; and whether you

choose to make the issue that of modifying the platform or that of political expediency, according to your own record you are not in a position to criticize in regard to such actions.

But there is more. Governor Ferguson, in an interview, said:

> The majority plank is not the belief nor the conviction of the Democratic Party, and in the desire to secure a little political advantage this fatal surrender of Democratic principles is made. The crux of the whole situation is that we were told if we did not adopt the majority proposal that we might lose three or four Western States.

Now, if it should be true, my friends, that Mr. Hughes modified his views or added to the platform, as contended—and I am assuming now for the sake of the argument which you make, and not the truth in fact—and that it was for political expediency, upon the statement of the distinguished senator from Missouri and the able leader from Texas, for what reason was the plank inserted in the platform at St. Louis other than that of political expediency, and through the fear that possibly you might sacrifice the electoral vote in some of the Western States?

Mr. President, so far as I am individually concerned, I do not believe it added to the political strength of the candidate upon the Republican ticket to have made the declaration that he did make. I do not believe it has added one particle of strength to the platform as a vote-getting proposition; and I am disposed to believe, therefore, that it was his sincere expression with reference to this proposition. I differ with him entirely. I do not believe in the Anthony amendment. I do not believe in the principle upon which it is founded. I believe we should have fought it out through the States, and I believe it will ultimately come through the States. I could not for party's sake or for any other reason change my view. It is fundamental with me.

THE PRESSING PROBLEM THAT CONFRONTS US

By Anna P. H. Ford

WOMAN suffrage is not the pressing question of this critical hour. Yet it is a question of such far reaching importance that it should be made either a major issue or none. As a minor issue, it would receive the scant and casual attention which begets hasty and mistaken decisions: and, in this case, when the mistake came to be realized it would be almost impossible to undo. The issue should await for its settlement a time in our political history when it can be considered by the people with all the thoroughness that its extraordinary gravity demands. Surely this is not such a time. The pressing problem that confronts us is whether or not our government is being conducted with an intelligent understanding of its ideals, functions and interests, and with a powerfully efficient application of them. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we realize that this issue, involving foreign affairs as well as domestic, is too absorbing to be confused by the unnecessary introduction of extraneous problems into this campaign. If nearly all Republicans were anti-suffragists and nearly all Democrats suffragists, or vice versa, the inopportuneness of the suffrage issue would be less unquestionable: but such is not the situation. The people, now in a state of unprecedented indecision as to the part they will play in the world's history, desire to concentrate their attention upon the problem whether the Democratic conception of Americanism is true or false, and whether the Democratic party has conducted our affairs with honor, foresight, and skill. If that is made the one and only issue, foreign nations as well as we ourselves will arrive at a clear understanding of our national and international purposes. A verdict partly influenced by differences upon woman suffrage would be ambiguous.

A rich and militant organization, the so-called Woman's Party, is endeavoring to intimidate politicians by asserting that it can induce the enfranchised women to vote against any candidate who disobeys its commands. Yet it is proper to recall the fact that heretofore such threats have been vain. The candidates whom the Congressional Union "blacklisted" were triumphantly elected. In the presidential campaign of 1912, the candidate who actively supported woman suffrage fared no better in woman suffrage States than in male suffrage States. The comparatively few women voters (a glance at the registration records will show their numbers to be vastly exaggerated) have voted as Republicans against Democrats, not as women against men. Up to the present, then, movements like the Woman's Party have been strikingly unsuccessful. If they were successful in 1916, that success would add to the reasons why woman suffrage is a peril to our well-being: for it would demonstrate that sex-antagonism can be introduced into the political arena.

Before woman suffrage can succeed in actual practice, two conditions, now non-existent, need to be established. In the first place, it must be introduced with the well-considered and cordial support of the male voters. Without their support, the votes of women would be of precarious effect; and their political action might by various processes be inhibited, ignored, or even defied. The anti-suffrage victories in Michigan, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts and Iowa show beyond dispute that after thorough discussion the men of such States are very strongly opposed to woman suffrage. The project of a Federal Amendment is an obvious attempt to evade a popular referendum, the suffrage leaders having learned that a woman's personal solicitation among smaller legislative bodies (with all its socially unwholesome possibilities) is more likely to be effectual than the public propaganda of their arguments. Suffragists have long opposed a referendum of their case to women, knowing that less than 10 per cent of the women would support them; now they wish to evade a referendum to men, having learned that this likewise means defeat. Under these circumstances the imposition of political duties upon women in all the States by Federal Amendment is obviously unfair. What is commonly ignored, however, is that it would also be highly inexpedient, in that many practical difficulties and bitter dissensions would be created by the forcing of women into an activity where the men would give them an unfriendly if not hostile reception.

In the second place, woman suffrage cannot succeed unless women willingly undertake the political duties thrust upon them. But by enfranchisement the great majority of women are placed in a dilemma: either they must slight those responsibilities to their families and to society which only they can carry out—responsibilities which in these days demand more time and energy than ever—or they must slight their duties as voters. Most of the enfranchised women have chosen the latter as the least of two evils; and in consequence there are no States in the Union where the electorate is so neglectful of its duties as that of the woman suffrage States. The result has been the inevitable one—inefficient or corrupt government, of which States like Colorado and municipalities like Seattle have lately given striking examples.

The suffragists declare "democracy" one of their watchwords. In point of truth, their propaganda is a danger to the perpetuity—because to the efficiency—of American democracy. Their "democracy" is nominal rather than real. Nominal democracy would logically lead to the enfranchisement of the child and the alien; true representative democracy, giving each class political power in proportion to its numbers, we have already; for women are not a class but a sex, providentially distributed among all our classes in almost exact proportion to men, and no class would gain or lose relative political strength by their enfranchisement. Our problem is not to create democracy, but to preserve it against undermining influences at home and

against enemies abroad. Male suffrage is as democratic as double suffrage; and it is incomparably more efficient because it provides for the expression of the popular will in the most impressively powerful manner. In this hour of danger and conflict, we fortunately have a forceful electorate; and in all future crises we shall need one.

THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO RULE

(New York *Journal of Commerce*)

WHENEVER the determination of qualifications for the exercise of the suffrage has come before the people of the United States the matter has been dealt with in a spirit of levity, indifference or blind optimism that is all too characteristic of our country. It is true that the whole matter is left to the final judgment of the people of the individual States by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the only real restriction being the terms of the Fifteenth Amendment which prevent discrimination on account of "race, color or previous condition of servitude." Within these limits the State discretion is broad, and the important duty of deciding upon the policy of the government, the levying of taxes, the welfare of the people and the very existence of the nation, is given with rare prodigality and with little regard to its importance. It is laid upon an electorate which is by no means capable of properly performing it.

The franchise is conferred on widely differing grounds in the various States. The main qualification, which is required in all, is that the voter be a male of the age of at least twenty-one years. In eleven States, all of them situated in the Middle or Far West, the duty is also laid upon women upon the same terms. On the other hand, nine of the States actually allow foreigners, not yet citizens of the United States, to vote in State and hence in national elections. That is to say, any male foreigner twenty-one years of age or over, who has taken out his first papers declaring his intention to apply for citizenship, can vote on the same terms as native-born Americans. These first papers can be taken out after merely two years residence in the United States. Thus it well may happen that in a doubtful election matters of great importance may be finally decided by the votes of individuals who still are citizens of a foreign country.

In the matter of naturalization the practice has been nearly as bad. In the summer and fall of the year 1864, during the few months preceding the national election, 30,000 foreign-born men were naturalized in the city of New York alone. In the November following, Lincoln carried the State of New York over McClellan by a majority of less than 7,000. An analysis of the votes in the various States in that election will show that a change of 100,000 votes, in a total of over 4,000,000 cast, could have defeated Lincoln and elected McClellan. Probably more than that number of foreigners were naturalized in these States during that year, so it is not too much to say that in the most critical election in all their history the people of the United States put it within the power of foreigners of comparatively recent immigration to decide upon the continuance or the destruction of the Federal Union. The election of Lincoln was an absolute necessity if this united country should endure.

The effort is now being made by a minority of women to lay the duty of the franchise upon all the women of the country, and the politicians are handling the matter, as might be expected, merely from the standpoint of party expediency and with an eye single to the facility of carrying the election. The opposing candidates for the highest office in the land, President Wilson and Mr. Hughes, have declared themselves in favor of woman suffrage, differing merely in the expediency of State or national action. It is still a matter for wonder whether or not their conversion is too sudden to be genuine.

It would seem that the whole question of suffrage, male and female, and the qualifications necessary for its exercise should be thoroughly overhauled and a calm consideration be given to the subject before its final determination. A national election of the importance of the present one, at least of great potential importance when the critical state of the world's affairs is taken into account, is no time for a decision in this matter.

We know of nothing more calculated to discredit the cause of woman suffrage with reasoning people than the declaration adopted at the "Executive Conference" of the National Woman's Party at Colorado Springs. There are more important issues involved in the election of the President of the United States this year than the extension of woman suffrage, but perhaps it was to be expected that the woman's party would seek to make that the decisive factor. But why should it insist upon a change in the Federal Constitution to enable some States to force it upon others before they are ready for it or willing to have it, and seek to use the vote of twelve States where women already have the vote to turn the scale between present parties regardless of everything else involved in the election?

The general qualifications of the right to vote belong to State control and ought to belong there. The extension of the right to women can be made in any State when its people, men and women, are convinced that they desire it. It is safe to say that when the majority of women in any State are earnestly in favor of it they will be able to get it, and there is no reason why they should be coerced. The extension of the "cause" in States can be promoted in a more wholesome way by leaving each to decide for itself than by seeking to have some force it upon others. The latter cannot be done without securing a Constitutional amendment proposed by both houses of Congress by a two-thirds vote and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. That will take a long time and the forcing policy will delay rather than expedite it. Attempting to force it by having a small minority of electoral votes in States where women already help choose the electors turn the scale between parties, with all that may depend upon it, ought to react against it and defeat the purpose. That is an example of the unscrupulous use of political power for special ends.

A TASK NOT TO BE DELEGATED

(Newark, N. J., *News*)

IS it not reasonable when a change impends which alters the deepest foundation on which the government rests, that the will of the people be taken as directly as possible? In the last analysis the American Government rests on suffrage, the voters. State legislatures, though professedly representative, as a matter of fact do not command very great confidence. It is a distinct tendency of the times to seek to restrain or rebuild these law-making bodies. That is to say, that the people do not admit, without qualification, their truly representative nature.

Because this is true, the submission of woman suffrage State by State rather than by national amendment seems the just method. By the first the amendment must be submitted to the qualified voters of each State. The people are asked directly to say whether they will retain or change the foundation of the Government. By the second the decision is left to congressmen and State legislators.

And not only that, but by the process of Federal amendment it is not only possible but probable that the change would be made by an actual minority. Four thinly populated Western States would count equally with such centers of population as New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New Jersey. The Western group might not have the voting population of a single Eastern city, but it would count as many votes as the densely populated Eastern.

It seems that this is one of the questions that the people should keep in their own hands.

THE SOUTH AND SUFFRAGE

(Richmond, Va., *Times*)

IT will be an evil day for this country, and especially for the South, when the prerogatives and reserved powers of the States that relate to the ballot again are invaded, for the first time since the horrors of Reconstruction. Whether woman suffrage in itself is desirable or undesirable, good or bad, this statement remains true. It is of the highest importance to the Southern States that they shall retain the privilege of saying under what circumstances and conditions the voting privilege shall be exercised. This right lies at the base of their civilization, and in safety and honor they cannot surrender it. If the Federal Constitution is amended to give women the vote, it can, and will, be amended in other similar ways. Every safeguard the South has erected will be swept aside.

There are other and potent reasons why the suffrage should not be thrust on women who do not want it. It is a matter of common observation in Virginia, for example, that the women who oppose suffrage are in the proportion of four or five to one to those who favor it. The strong probability is that the proportion is much greater, but beyond any question it is as great as we have stated it. What possible sense is there in thrusting an obligation they do not seek and a responsibility from which they shrink on 80 per cent. or more of Virginia's womanhood? What good could spring from such folly?

It is a satisfaction to his admirers that the President has refused to be stampeded and has declined to permit political exigencies to drive him from well-grounded political principles. He can leave that sort of thing to his opponent, already making a bid for the support of every special interest in the country. Mr. Wilson's appeal is to the whole people, and never better than in the matter under discussion has he shown himself entitled to popular support.

A CALIFORNIA EDITOR ON SUFFRAGE "TESTIMONY"

(San Francisco *Argonaut*, July, 1916).

A CERTAIN tendency to distort facts may usually be noticed in the expert and the enthusiast. Sallying forth in pursuit of evidence for his pet project or contention, he never fails to find it, even though he may have to manufacture it for the purpose. Probably we are still a long way from a realization of the extent to which we are systematically fed on assertions of things that are not so, on assurances of conditions that do not exist, on solemn statements of supposed facts that actually have no basis of reality. At least half of our opinions are founded on fictions.

For example, there is a lady called Helen V. Barg, and she is a member of the Industrial Welfare Commission of California, and therefore an ardent suffragist. It seems that the Springfield Equal Suffrage League is anxious to inform itself on conditions in California as they relate to women and to the suffrage, and so it addresses a series of questions to Helen V. Barg and prints her replies to the extent of about a column and a half. Now whether the women of California have actually done so much to make us all happy as these replies would indicate is not a matter for discussion in this column. Whether the gates of an earthly paradise have swung open before our eyes as the result of the various tax-eating commissions that have been aptly described as homes for indigent politicians might perhaps be challenged, but not here. Whether women have had other than a pernicious influence upon legislation is a subject for debate, but not on the present occasion. At the moment we can only think of one achievement that was definitely feminine, and that was the recall of Judge Weller, who subsequently died of chagrin, and his replacement by Judge Crist, which was a flying leap from the frying-pan into the fire and a definite impetus to the degradation of the police bench. But let that pass.

The question that attracts our attention is as follows: "Are the women of your State or city treated with less consideration, chivalry, or courtesy than they were before enfranchisement?" The incredible reply is: "Certainly not. . . Women have been accorded much more consideration as members of the community since 1911."

Now it will be observed that this reply is an evasion. The question speaks of "consideration, chivalry, or courtesy." The reply speaks only of "consideration as members of the community." None the less it is intended to convey the impression of an emphatic and inclusive negative. And no doubt the sisterhood in Springfield will solemnly add it to their already vast stock of misinformation. It will take its place among the alleged facts that have been ascertained and that are henceforth indisputable. It will become a part of their archives. It will form a basis for what they call their views.

Now it is most emphatically untrue to assert or to suggest that women have been treated with more "consideration, chivalry, or courtesy" since 1911. As a matter of fact these virtues practically disappeared so far as the general public is concerned when the suffrage agitation first came on the stage of practical politics. The change was obvious and unmistakable. It became a matter of general comment everywhere. Ten years ago it may be said with some certainty that no woman was ever allowed to stand in a street-car. To-day we see women standing in every street-car that is crowded. The only women who command even the pretense of precedence at the hands of the public are old women and women with babies, and it is not invariably extended even to them. And it may be said that there is an active and a practical dislike of the woman who takes a conspicuous part in public affairs. There is a definite sex antagonism, and it has resulted everywhere in a lowering of the social status of women.

We do not know what may be the ideals of Helen V. Barg, or indeed if she has any, but there is one passage in her reply that must surely arouse some questionings in the minds of real women. She says, "The relations of men and women, as of men toward other men, are fundamentally economic." Are they indeed? How little this lady knows either of men or of women. The relations of men to men are not fundamentally economic. They are fundamentally social and human. Men have lived together in the past and will doubtless live together in the future, without any economic considerations, but community life would be impossible for a single day without the human and social relations. Economic considerations may be necessary and inevitable, but none the less thay are disruptive and disintegrating. By their very nature they are explosive. Men are able to tolerate each other, not because of their economic relations, but in spite of them. They would not be able to tolerate each other at all if it were not for a social comradeship and good-fellowship that act as a perpetual lubricant to the economic frictions. And perhaps this may be a suitable place to suggest that women are not likely to succeed in their "economic relations" because they are so gravely lacking in comradeship and good-fellowship.

And how will women in general, real women, feminine women, like to be told that their relations with men are to be the same as the relations of men to men? Is that actually their ambition? Does Helen V. Barg speak as one having authority? Does she represent her sex? It is true that there are some women who, for quite obvious reasons, must confine their relations with men to an economic basis or go without altogether. But in the case of ninety-nine women out of a hundred we have not noticed any weaning of the sex factor. Quite the contrary. Nor do we expect to notice it. Nor do we believe that women have the slightest desire that their relations with men shall be "fundamentally economic," that is to say financial. In point of fact it is pure and unadulterated nonsense.

THE SUFFRAGE FIGHT FOR FEDERAL ACTION

THE "emergency convention" of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, called two months ahead of the usual time to "consider the crisis in suffrage affairs" caused by both parties adopting platforms inimical to the Federal suffrage amendment, was held at Atlantic City September 6th to 10th. The most important result of this convention, aside from the publicity obtained by reason of President Wilson's address and the present tense political situation, was the subordination of State to Federal work, and the centralization of practically all campaign power in the hands of the National Association and its Board.

The history of this achievement—which was perhaps the real object of the convention—is of deep interest.

THE THREE-CORNERED DEBATE

On Wednesday, the 6th, the delegates listened to a "three-cornered debate." The State rights advocates were represented by Miss Laura Clay, of Kentucky, and Miss Kate Gordon, of Louisiana. Miss Clay gave the history of the first Constitutional convention of the Continental Congress, paid her respects to Thomas Jefferson and Democracy, and declared that the Solid South would forever block another Federal amendment interfering with the right of the States to settle the question of suffrage.

The Federalists were represented by Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, suffrage historian, who pleaded for concentration on the amendment, stating that the two parties had adopted State rights suffrage planks because "they knew it would put off suffrage till doomsday."

She also said that the suffragists had won only nine times in forty State campaigns; that "two generations have passed away and a third has grown white-haired in the struggle" for suffrage through the States; that it might take another forty years by this method. She added:

"If a State defeat the first time was followed by a victory on the second trial, it might be endured, but often the effect is to stimulate the opposition to call out their full strength, resulting in worse defeat. This was the case in Ohio and Michigan; it may be in New York and Pennsylvania."

As for Thomas Jefferson, Mrs. Harper declared that she had recently examined his writings and found that he was strongly opposed to the vote for woman. (He was, as anti-suffragists have pointed out frequently. See New York *Times*, February 27, 1915.)

Mrs. Glendower Evans, of Massachusetts, also spoke for exclusive Federal action. Mrs. Raymond Brown, of New York, and Miss Florence Allen, of Ohio, advocated both Federal and State action.

THEIR VOTE NOT TO COUNT.

The debate was then discussed from the floor, but every speaker pleaded for the continuance of both methods. Mrs. Catt, who presided, put the resolution to strike out Federal action to a vote, after announcing that another resolution on the subject would be introduced, and that the vote would not be considered final. In other words, that if they voted *against* Federal action, their votes would not count! The resolution was defeated. Then the resolution to strike out State action was voted down, following an eloquent appeal by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, in which she said that all the progress hitherto made had been made through the States; asserted that it was impossible to obtain the ratification of a Federal amendment until the majority of the men were in favor of suffrage, and discounted the optimism of the Federalists as to obtaining suffrage from State Legislatures by citing the case of Delaware.

"If it were easy to get the vote from Legislatures they would have obtained the vote long ago in Delaware," she declared. [Delaware is the only State where suffrage may be granted by the Legislature without a referendum to the voters.]

"But the Delaware Legislature defeated woman suffrage by a greater majority than any other Legislature in the country," she added.

A SPECIMEN OF SUFFRAGE SINCERITY

Then a remarkable thing happened. Mrs. Harper announced that she didn't really believe in Federal action exclusively herself; that she had spoken for it only at the request of Mrs. Catt, on the understanding that she was to be allowed to make an announcement "to save her reputation" after the debate. In other words, Mrs. Harper acknowledged that she, in conjunction with Mrs. Catt, had been a party to a conspiracy to fool these women, if possible, into adopting a program not even believed in by its advocates! Probably no such naive admission of insincerity has ever been made at a political convention. The astonishing part of it is that if Mrs. Harper was giving a false idea of her attitude in the debate, she has been doing it for two years to the press of the country!

In fact, her debate was made up almost entirely of verbatim extracts from an article in favor of the Federal amendment which she wrote for the *North American Review* in May, 1914. Furthermore, on July 26, 1916, Mrs. Harper represented to a reporter for the *Herald-Republican*, of Salt Lake City, Utah, that:

"For the first time in the history of the National Association a partisan stand is to be taken at the convention which will assemble in Atlantic City, September 6th."

She is also quoted by him as saying: "There is no hope for the Democratic party in this matter, as it is the State's rights party," and "we are tired of fighting for State after State. We have reached the end of our resources and the twelve States which now have suffrage seem to me to be the only ones we will ever get. The defeat in Iowa was a set-back to our cause. Our poll of the State showed we had three-quarters of the vote, but it was reversed on election day, evidence that we have no chance against the secret ballot."

FORCING FEDERAL ACTION

After Mrs. Harper's astonishing confession, Mrs. Catt introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the forty-eighth annual convention of the American National Suffrage Association interpret Article 2 of the Constitution, which pledges our auxiliaries to secure the vote for women by appropriate national and State action as meaning that the Federal amendment is our immediate and principal aim and that all State campaigns, whether legislative or referendum, are preparatory to this end.

Miss Clay was on her feet in an instant, charging that the resolution was a partisan move and demanding that it be tabled. She insisted that it was equivalent to an indorsement of the Republican party, that it was an attempt to interpret "State and Federal action to mean *only* Federal action."

"While we are talking about freedom, let's see what freedom we have," she declared. "To expect that women who come here as Democrats and Prohibitionists and Socialists shall go away Republicans is an invasion of personal freedom."

Mrs Catt asserted that the resolution was non-partisan. The motion to table it was lost, and it was postponed for consideration the following day.

"A NATIONALIZED SCHEME"

The next move by the Federalists, aided by the so-called advocates of "both methods," was to frame up a platform to accomplish practically the same end. This platform was objected to by the State rights advocates on the same ground as the resolution; that it meant concentration on Federal action. The platform places practically all power in the hands of the National Association and its Board. Its salient points, proving this, follow:

1. The National Board shall continue to conduct a campaign in support of the Federal amendment.

2. It shall continue a lobby in Washington until the Federal Amendment shall be submitted.

3. It shall conduct a nation-wide campaign of education, agitation, organization and publicity in support of the Federal Amendment.

4. The nation-wide campaign shall include the following:

(a) A million dollar campaign fund for the campaign from October 1, 1916, to October 1, 1917.

(b) A monthly propaganda demonstration to be simultaneously conducted throughout the nation.

(c) At least four campaign directors and two hundred organizers in the field and a vigorous, thorough organization in every State.

(d) A nationalized scheme for education through literature. • • •

2. No State association shall ask the Legislature of its State for the submission of a State constitutional amendment or for the submission of the question by the initiative or referendum until the National Board of Executive Council has been given the opportunity to investigate conditions and give consent.

(a) Any State which proceeds to a referendum campaign without securing this consent shall be prepared to finance its own campaign without help from the National Board. * * *

5. The rule that the National Board shall do nothing in the States without the consent of the State shall be repealed. * * *

8. The National Board shall have the authority to nationalize the suffrage movement by unifying the work as far as is possible.

Notwithstanding the demand by the State rights advocates that this platform be considered seriatim, every attempt to modify it or to consider any of its items separately was defeated, and it was finally passed with little numerical opposition.

A LAWLESS PIECE OF PAPER

Flushed with this success, the Federalists tried again to pass Mrs. Catt's resolution. Mrs. Antoinette Funk, of Chicago, a lawyer, declared that it had no more legal standing than the paper it was written on; that it violated a principle of law as old as the law of Moses—that a legislative act could not be repealed or amended by any authority inferior to that by which it was originally adopted—that they were really trying to amend their association constitution by interpretation; that such a thing could no more be done by the convention than Congress could pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment by interpretation. Mrs. George Bass, of Chicago, and chairman of the woman's bureau of the National Democratic Committee, then declared that the resolution was wholly partisan; that it took a stand different from that of either great party in its platform, and was practically an indorsement of the attitude of the presidential candidate. Dr. Shaw spoke against the resolution, insisting that the country would regard it as partisan, no matter what it was called in the convention. It was defeated.

One "reaffirming" the "non--partisanship" of the convention was adopted.

Another resolution to the effect that the convention would support only those candidates who favor the Federal amendment was introduced. This, virtually, was an authorization of the "black-list." A mere man delegate objected to it on the ground that the suffragists should not exhibit too much "indirect influence" and said that if he thought they could elect and defeat men without the vote, he would lose all interest in the "cause." A woman asked: "Madam President, how can we support anybody when we have no visible means of support?"

The resolution was finally referred to the board for such action as it should determine. "Blacklisting" is thus authorized, and the board has already started a canvass among candidates to learn their sentiments.

"PUTTING IT OVER"

But the Federalists, cooled somewhat in their ardor for the amendment exclusively, were not to be shaken in their determination to get the association to concentrate on Federal action, however much they might have to modify the wording of the original resolution to "put it over."

On Saturday, the convention passed Mrs. Catt's resolution in a new form, as follows:

"Be It Resolved, That the forty-eighth annual convention of the National American Woman Sucrage Association instruct its Congressional committee to conduct a determined effort to carry the Federal amendment through the last session of the Sixty-fourth Congress. It pledges the support of the State organizations and authorizes the National Board to take such direction of the work in the States as may be necessary in its judgment to accomplish this."

One will readily see that this is merely a modification of the original resolution, and represents a final triumph for the Federalists, although they can still claim "nonpartisanship" on technicalities. The main point they have accomplished: the subordination of all State work to Federal work, under the dominant control of the National Board. This is apparent both in the platform and the resolution finally passed.

Lest it appear that this is an anti-suffrage viewpoint, Ruth Crosby Dimmick, of the New York *Telegraph,* and staunch suffragist, says of it:

"The resolution submitted by Mrs. Catt the first day was twisted about a trifle and passed this afternoon. * * * This is virtually the resolution Mrs. Catt introduced Wednesday, only its adoption at that time was considered by the majority to mean a declaration of partisanship."

ABANDONED HOPES AND STATES.

Other features of the convention were the announcement that Tennessee suffragists, since the recent defeat of the constitutional convention, had abandoned all hope of getting suffrage from the votes of that State and relied on Federal action; the admission that in California, the president of the suffragists "did not know whether they were alive or dead, as they had held but one meeting since 1911 and had contributed only $10 last year to the National Association"; and the great "million dollar" campaign fund—or publicity stunt.

MONEY OR THE MAJORITY?

Approximately $800,000 was "pledged," of which about 10 per cent. is supposed to go to the National. New York, if it keeps its word, will spend $225,000 for suffrage; Pennsylvania, $125,000; Massachusetts, $60,000, and a number of other States from $5,000 to $30,000. Two individual women—not named—pledged $10,000 each; several $5,000 and $1,000 each.

After President Wilson's address Friday night, which has been too widely quoted to need repetition here, Mrs. Catt remarked that "if money talks it tells us that when a movement can raise $800,000 in forty minutes, victory is not far away."

It is now a fight of "money"—or pledges—against the will of the majority of women to remain out of politics; and against the votes of the majority of the men who represent them at the polls.

It remains to be seen whether a minority and money or majority rule shall settle the suffrage question.

Mrs. Catt devoted about one hour of her presidential address of "two hours, twenty-seven minutes and nine sips of water" to the liquor charge, exhibiting various ballots to show how easily "illiterates" *could be* instructed to vote against suffrage by "bribers," who, she said, "are the allies of the antis." But she neglected to exhibit evidence in even *one* case where it *had* been done.—J. S. E.

"THE RIGHT TO FREE PARENTHOOD"

ONE of the most extreme utterances ever made by the suffragists in convention was that of the president of the National Council of Women Voters, who told the delegates of the National American Woman Suffrage Association—with which her organization is affiliated—that the women voters were working "to establish the right to free parenthood."

"We believe that every child by its birth is made legitimate, and that it should have exactly the same rights to support and inheritance, whether its parents are married or not," she said.

This plea for "free parenthood" drew wild applause from the delegates. Moreover, as this woman is a leader, not only of suffragists, but of women voters, her sentiments must be taken as thoroughly representative.

Probably few of her applauding hearers understood the real significance of her remarks. If they had, probably some would resent it.

But can anyone doubt that permanent marriage is an institution primarily for the benefit of the child? If it is to make no difference to the child whether its parents are married or not, to whom is it to make any difference? The next logical step is the recognition of "free motherhood," "free fatherhood" and "free love."

"The right to free parenthood, support and inheritance!" With no legal evidence of the father's identity—which marriage, and marriage alone, in most cases supplies—how is the child to claim "support and inheritance?" From the mother? And if she, under the impulse of "the right to free motherhood," craves another companion or freedom from maternal duties and deserts the child in its infancy, the child must apply to the State for its "support and inheritance."

In other words, is not the specious and shallow plea for "free parenthood" a scheme full of possibilities for the encouragement of immorality, orphan asylums and blackmail?

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION

"IT is a great confession of weakness to assume that prohibition cannot be carried as other reforms have been carried, by manhood suffrage," wrote William G. Frost, in the Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition, in 1891.

"Conservative minds would hesitate to have prohibition enacted before a majority of the men are enlisted in its favor. The impression of female sentiment on the temperance question which one gathers at a W. C. T. U. convention is scarcely representative of the community at large. In general, wherever we find a man who sustains the saloon, directly or indirectly, we may be sure there is somewhere a woman—the female of his species—to match him."

This shrewd observer, over twenty-four years ago, pointed out a truth that is proved by the record of to-day.

Prohibition has gained nothing from woman suffrage.

It cannot gain anything from woman suffrage.

Man's relation to liquor cannot be changed by changing woman's relation to government. Women cannot enforce any law, least of all a prohibition law, against the will of the majority of men.

The only relation between woman suffrage and the liquor question is one of ceaseless misrepresentation and false statements on the part of the suffragists. Anti-suffragists have been forced to give up all hope of getting *even the leaders* of the woman suffrage cause to tell the truth on this subject, and therefore submit the following facts:

I. ACTION OF PROHIBITION STATES ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

PROHIBITION ADOPTED		ACTION ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE	
STATE	YEAR		YEAR
Kansas	1880*	Adopted	1912*
Maine	1884*	*Defeated*	1915
North Dakota	1889*	*Defeated*	1914*
Oklahoma	1907*	*Defeated*	1916
Mississippi	1908	(No Campaign)	
Georgia	1908	*Defeated*	1916
Tennessee	1909	(No Campaign)	
North Carolina	1909*	*Defeated*	1915
West Virginia	1914*	(To be submitted to voters,	1916)
Alabama	1915	*Defeated*	1915
Arizona	1915*	Adopted	1912*
South Carolina	1915*	*Defeated*	1916
Arkansas	1915	*Defeated*	1915
Colorado	1915*	Adopted	1893*
Idaho	1916	Adopted	1896*
Iowa	1916	*Defeated*	1916*
Oregon	1916*	Adopted	1912*
Washington	1916*	Adopted	1910*
Virginia	1916	*Defeated*	1916

*By popular vote. Otherwise action was taken by Legislature.

From the above table we get these facts:

1. Twelve of the nineteen prohibition States have *rejected* woman suffrage.

2. Only six of the nineteen prohibition States have adopted woman suffrage.

3. Only four of the nineteen prohibition States have gone "dry" with women voting.

4. One *prohibition* State, Kansas, had prohibition *32 years* before it adopted *woman suffrage.*

5. One *woman suffrage* State, Colorado, had woman suffrage *23 years* before it adopted *prohibition.*

II. ACTION OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE STATES ON PROHIBITION

On the other hand, what have the other woman suffrage States done for prohibition? Wyoming, oldest woman suffrage State, with 47 years of votes for women, is a "wet" State; and liquor is sold *on Sunday* in some parts of Wyoming, according to the latest Anti-Saloon Yearbook. California, largest woman suffrage State, gave the heaviest majority ever registered *against prohibition,* with women voting, in 1914! Montana and Nevada, "wettest States in the Union," are both suffrage States. In Montana, in 1914, the suffrage societies *refused to parade* with the W. C. T. U. In Nevada, in 1914, *the suffrage officials openly advertised for liquor support;* and in 1915 women voters of Reno were openly *praised by the liquor interests* for their "wet" votes. These four "wet" suffrage States certainly offset any claim made for women's votes in the four suffrage States that have gone "dry" with women voting.

In sixteen State campaigns in the last four years, Montana and Nevada are the *only* States which have adopted suffrage. Iowa and North Dakota, "dry" States, both *defeated* it.

Moreover, a study of these four suffrage States that have adopted prohibition by popular vote, Colorado, Arizona, Washington and Oregon, shows that they went "dry" because of men's votes and would have adopted prohibition regardless of woman suffrage.

In Arizona there are 168 men to every 100 women; in Washington there are 160; in Oregon, 153; and in Colorado, 127. The men in these States do most of the voting and are in the overwhelming majority. The men, and not the women—who have never been known to cast even 50 per cent. of their possible vote—are responsible for prohibition.

Colorado defeated prohibition in 1912, with women voting, after nearly twenty years of woman suffrage. But in 1914 Colorado adopted prohibition by popular vote at the time of a Billy Sunday revival. The Rev. Billy Sunday has claimed that it was his famous sermon against rum which is given to "men only" which converted Colorado. If he is right, the women had nothing to do with it whatever, being excluded from hearing the sermon that is supposed to have made their State "dry." Denver, however, the largest city, and where the proportion of women is highest, went "wet."

In Idaho, a suffrage State which adopted prohibition by legislative act, there are 158 men to every 100 women, and the Legislature, elected mostly by men, was composed almost exclusively of men. In Kansas, of course, woman suffrage is no more responsible for prohibition than it is for prohibition in Maine or North Dakota. In no instance has any State gone "dry" on account of votes for women. The facts prove that *you cannot change man's relation to liquor by changing woman's relation to government.*

In the words of Senator Bray, of Wisconsin:

"Many are suffragists only because of saloons. They want women to have the ballot only to bring about prohibition.

"In my opinion, the liquor problem is of minor importance in comparison with the suffrage question. Whether or not women vote, it is generally admitted that the liquor problem will be permanently solved in the course of time by laws that will have public sentiment back of them to make them enforceable. On the other hand, equal suffrage is for all time.

"When suffrage for women is once granted it is an irrevocable step. How unfortunate it would be to take an irrevocable step for a reason that will no longer exist after a comparatively short time."

WOMEN WHO ARE AFRAID OF WOMAN

(Philadelphia, Pa., *Inquirer*)

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT, the stormy petrel of the troubled waters of "votes for women," takes issue with the *Inquirer.* This journal suggested the other day that the proper manner for the settlement of the franchise question was to leave it to the women themselves; that it would favor a referendum in Pennsylvania at which only the women could vote and by means of which they could decide whether they wanted the ballot or did not. The declaration was also made that the suffragists did not favor such a plan because they were afraid that they would not be in the majority.

Mrs. Catt, as was to be expected, opposes the idea. She says, what is of course true, that women cannot be enfranchised except through a Constitutional amendment. The women have no power to enfranchise themselves. To carry out the plan of a referendum would require two campaigns—one to induce the men to consent to it, the other to "get out the women to vote on the question." Nothing, she thinks, would have been gained by it.

We might suggest that the women are so used to making campaigns that one campaign more or less would not matter. That is not where the shoe pinches. After the men had been persuaded to allow the women to take a vote on the subject, it would require a campaign to get the women to the polls. That is her admission. And no doubt she is right. It most certainly would require a good deal of hard work to drive the women of Pennsylvania up to the polls in sufficient numbers to show anything like a majority for suffrage. Here, dear lady, is your trouble. It is your confession of fear—of fear that the majority of women themselves do not want the ballot.

Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts at the last election voted against woman suffrage. Why? There may have been various reasons, but one of them most certainly was the thought that it would be wrong to force the ballot upon an unwilling majority of women. The *Inquirer* does not believe that the bulk of the women of this State want to vote. But it is entirely willing that they should vote if they insist upon it in majority numbers. Which is why it would like to see the matter settled by the women themselves.

It is the only fair way. But Mrs. Catt will not take it. She therefore places herself in the position of advocating the tyrannical rule of the majority by the minority. She is afraid of her own sex. She admits it when she confesses that a campaign would be required to get the women to the polls. The point she makes in her own defense is that even if the women did vote in favor of the franchise, the men would not be obligated to grant it. That is begging the question. The women are in the habit of getting what they really want.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE WEST VIRGINIA DEBATES

AS a sample of suffrage efforts to distort and suppress the truth, the following is of interest from the so-called *Woman's Journal* of Boston, official suffrage organ:

WEST VIRGINIA.

A valuable suffrage edition of the Clarksburg *Telegram* was published during the recent conference in that city. The *Telegram* says of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt's address before the Democratic State convention in Parkersburg:

"No woman in the history of the State has received so enthusiastic a greeting at the hands of a political gathering as did the brilliant head of the equal suffrage movement. The ovation was as spontaneous as it was enthusiastic. It began among the delegates and was taken up by the vast audience and continued for several minutes.

"Old-time attendants at State conventions said they had never seen anything like it since the war, and the younger generations of politicians looked on in amazement and ended by joining in the demonstration."

The *Woman's Journal*, with characteristic reserve, refrains from mentioning the fact that the *anti-suffrage* speaker at this convention, in the estimation of all present, *won the debate and most of the applause*. It quotes a statement designed to convey exactly the opposite impression.

Contrast the above report with that of all three *Parkersburg* papers:

The convention, after hearing Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt in the afternoon, listened for half an hour to Mrs. O. D. Oliphant on anti-suffrage. Mrs. Oliphant drew forth more applause than the preceding speaker and caught the fancy of the crowd with pointed replies to the address of Mrs. Catt. But while the convention gave more applause to Mrs. Oliphant, her recommendations were not accepted in the adoption of the platform.—*Sentinel.*

To many persons the most interesting event of the Democratic state judicial convention here yesterday was the joint discussion of the suffrage issue between Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the foremost exponent of the cause in the United States, if not in the world, and Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, of New Jersey, an anti-suffrage speaker who entered the convention a stranger and left it in triumph.

Even though a plank indorsing woman's suffrage to some extent was inserted in the platform, Mrs. Oliphant won her fight before the convention, and the effect of her declaration was plainly discernable in the objections that arouse at night to the discussion of the suffrage declaration.—*News.*

Gilbert Smith of Pleasants county radically opposed the adoption of the suffrage plank and *demanded* to know why it was *inserted* in the face of the fact that it was not *wanted* there. He said that if the *members* could have *witnessed* the *demonstration* in the *afternoon* in *opposition* to the question he was satisfied that it would not have been placed there. He insisted that neither the Democrats or Republicans of his county were in favor of the amendment and expressed the opinion that it would be defeated by a heavy majority.—*Journal.*

The Monroe *Watchman* said:

"Mrs. Catt led off in a very good speech from her standpoint and was respectfully applauded.

"Mrs. Oliphant followed and her address took everybody by surprise and swept the convention off its feet. She turned out to be one of the most keen-witted and well-equipped debaters that has ever been heard on this subject in West Virginia. As the suffrage advocates admitted, 'the little New Jersey woman whipped our Mrs. Catt to a farewell.' The convention roared with applause and shouted with laughter. Mrs. Oliphant made no set speech but replied to Mrs. Catt extemporaneously with all the skill of the trained debater.

"A number of suffragists from Parkersburg who came to enjoy Mrs. Catt's victory were deeply disappointed. These ladies could not conceal their chagrin, and in the midst of Mrs. Oliphant's triumph while the convention was thundering applause of her telling points, got up and flaunted out of the opera house with every visible token of uncontrollable anger."

It is the suffrage custom to show anger rather than advance argument, when they meet their opponents, and to distort or suppress anything showing how the public actually receives and supports anti-suffrage speakers.

The Democratic platform adopted after a long argument, is as follows:

"The woman's suffrage amendment has been submitted to the people and while the convention has no power to bind the individual voters of the party, it expresses its conviction that the amendment should be ratified."

No mention was made in the platform of the prohibition question, leaders being quoted as saying that the question is not an issue.

Mr. Johnson, who presented the majority report, addressed the convention urging the adoption of that report as a whole as it voiced the sentiments of the party candidates as well as President Wilson and the National convention. He explained that the suffrage plank *in no way bound the individual* voter to vote for the amendment, but that it was *inserted* in the platform for the purpose of *eliminating* the *question* from the *campaign*, as it was reasonably certain that the Republicans in their platform would insert a plank indorsing the amendment.

At the Republican convention, the speakers were Mrs. O. D. Oliphant for the antis and Mrs. Antoinette Funk, of Chicago, for the suffragists.

"The delegates bestowed liberal applause on both speakers, and it was difficult to discern which drew the most favor," says one paper.

This, of course, did not prevent the suffragists from sending out free plate matter starting with the statement:

"The greatest reception ever given a woman or a cause in West Virginia was accorded to Mrs. Antoinette Funk of Illinois and the cause of equal suffrage by the recent Republican convention in Wheeling."

Mrs. Catt and Mrs. Funk are tied, in suffrage statements, for the "greatest reception" ever given a woman "in the history of the State."

The Republican plank adopted was as follows:

"The Republican party submitted to a vote of the people of West Virginia an amendment to our constitution giving the right to vote to women. It is the belief of this convention that best purposes of government will be advanced by the widest participation in public affairs of all intelligent citizens, and we do not believe that the power to participate wisely in public affairs is limited to sex."

THE PROGRESS OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT

WEST VIRGINIA

THE question of woman suffrage in West Virginia has already become a very lively one and is absorbing the serious attention of the voters. The Suffragists are daily realizing that their supposedly and much hoped for one-sided campaign is very disappointing to them. Mrs. O. D. Oliphant's unquestioned advantage over Mrs. Catt and Mrs. Funk, respectively in the State conventions of both the Democratic and Republican parties, has awakened the voters in both parties out of their heretofore indifference, or mistaken gallantry, to a serious realization of what suffrage would mean to our State, and the intense interest already evinced assures West Virginia a place along side of her sister State, Pennsylvania, as to suffrage. Arrangements are making for representation and speaking at practically all of our County Fairs. At the Fairmont Fair last week Miss Marjorie Dorman's joint debate with a suffragist easily won her the greater applause, and here as well as later in Mannington and Clarksburg she won over many heretofore indifferent or opposed. Miss Clara Markeson is successfully organizing our friends throughout the State. A large majority of the delegates to both State Conventions—which to put it to the test and then defeat and get rid of it—passed a milk and water suffrage plank, have gone home to vote and work against it. The unfair, intolerant and often abusive campaign of the suffragists is costing them many votes, and naturally so. The very many appeals from delegates to the State Conventions and from many other leading men who have heard Mrs. Oliphant, to have her speak all over the State, have been answered by our Association promptly securing her services from September 12th to the day of election in November.

MRS. D. C. GALLAHER.

CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

THE list of officers for the West Virginia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been completed recently, and contains the names of some of the representative women of the State, with a campaign committee of notable men assisting and cooperating with them. The list follows:

Honorary President, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont.

President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.

Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tolman, Charleston.

Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.

Vice Presidents, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling; Mrs. George Keller, Huntington; Mrs. Samuel George, Wellsburg; Miss Nellie Taylor, Parkersburg; Mrs. Bradford Clarkson, Thayer; Mrs. William N. Page, Ansted; Mrs. Gaston Caperton, Slab Fork; Mrs. Julia Beury, Beury.

State Board, Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins, Elkins; Mrs. Joseph H. Gaines, Mrs. G. S. Needham, Mrs. George E. Price, Mrs. Dabney C. T. Davis, Mrs. Charles E. Ward, Mrs. Robert S. Carr, Mrs. S. B. Avis, Charleston; Mrs. J. Carl Vance, Miss Cornelia Bassel, Clarksburg; Mrs. Sallie McCulloch, Mrs. W. F. Butler, Wheeling; Mrs. Dora Biggs, Lewisburg; Mrs. Garland Buffington, Huntington; Mrs. Simms Powell, Parkersburg.

Legislative Committee, Mrs. Malcolm Jackson, Mrs. W. E. R. Byrne.

Campaign Committee, Gov. A. B. Fleming, Col. J. Q. Dickinson, Hon. Malcolm Jackson, Hon. F. M. Staunton.

SOCIALISM!

NATIONAL Socialist Headquarters, in Chicago, plans to send a bureau of Socialist speakers into West Virginia to speak for woman suffrage, according to the Wheeling, West Virginia, *Register*. One of them has been arrested already, in that State, for militancy.

As always, the Socialist speakers are trying to stir up discontent among the workers, and do not mind making misstatements.

"Ever greater numbers of you working men fear to marry and undertake the care of a family," says one socialist-suffragist leaflet, which is a flat contradiction to the United States Census on the subject, which shows that the proportion of marriages actually increased from 1900 to 1910!

MASSACHUSETTS

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS of Wareham, Mattapoisett, Bourne and Pocasset assembled on the attractive lawn of Mrs. E. A. Gammons Wednesday afternoon, August 23, for the annual mid-Summer meeting. Miss Frances Hennessy opened the meeting, speaking of the plan to unite with the neighboring towns in three large meetings during the Summer months, and each branch to continue their study classes throughout the year. Miss Hennessy presented the new chairman, Mrs. Frank A. Besse, who spoke on membership. Mrs. Besse introduced Mrs. W. W. Churchill of Milton, the speaker, whose remarks were listened to with great interest. Mrs. James M. Codman emphasized the desire for increased membership. The Wareham branch will meet with Mrs. Curtis in Mattapoisett, September 8. After the meeting Mrs. Gammons served refreshments.

NEW YORK

NOBODY quite knows how it happened, but men from all over the state actually dared to hold up their heads right in front of women and explain just where they stood on the suffrage question. Not man to man, you understand, but man to women!

Chairman Fitzgerald led the way. The air was close and the suffragists posed in the most conspicuous corner of the balcony, had been fanning and nodding from the heat and smoke wafted up to them. "The home makers of our country demand an answer" solemnly stated the speaker. Everybody woke up. "It will require no desperate and unique appeals to incite the women of America to an interest in this campaign. But theirs will not be a boisterous part." (Everybody sat up!) "It will not be evidenced by parades and political rallies and frenzied appeals to passion. Who looks for such manifestations will look in vain. But in every home, however humble, where woman in all the glory of womanhood reigns supreme, her interests will be determined." (Every man looking at every other man and applauding vigorously.) "There will be no noisy demonstrations to affect the public judgment, but in the sanctity of home . . . for the cause of American womanhood, for peace on earth and good will to all men."

Wild applause from the floor, broad smiles and approving nods, but not a muscle moving in the amen corner of the balcony. Up there no one seemed to know whether to look straight ahead in stony stare of petrified disapproval, or at each other with affected curl of the lip. They didn't seem to know whether it was intended as a compliment or as another "insult from the democratic party."

PLATFORM COMMITTEE APPROVES PLANK.

Then came Robert F. Wagner, courteous Senator from New York, chairman of the Platform Committee, and with the echoes of the Fitzgerald applause still hitting the balcony, valiantly read the finding of the Committee that "the conferring of the right of suffrage upon men and women has been, is now and should remain exclusively a question to be determined by the people of the State."

"The Committee would not dare do it," Mrs. Norman DeR. Whitehouse is reported as saying, when it was suggested to her. "They would not dare insult us by perfunctorily endorsing something the women can do for themselves."

But they did dare. And the reason seems to be men are realizing that women suffragists are no longer content with being women or suffragists, but they must

needs turn politicians and try to beat the men at their own game. Threats of organized warfare on the democratic party from Washington to Colorado Springs; pretty promises "pleading, coaxing, cajoling" with mysterious hints of something dreadful to happen unless they had their way at Saratoga Springs, had an effect—but not the one women "politicians" had counted on.

NOT AS WOMEN: BUT POLITICIANS.

For two days they haunted the lobby of the Grand Union, openly attempting to attach themselves to a "Party." It wasn't a dignified position for *woman*, standing in crowded corridors trying to look pleasant and busy; all the time seeing men who, under other circumstances would at least be courteous, turn the cold shoulder or the studiously indifferent back and go calmly by. No woman likes that sort of thing, no matter how callous she may be. They had decided upon a hearing before the platform committee, and had very importantly drawn up a plank for the committee to insert in its platform. They also wanted to "pledge" the men.

The men were, to put it mildly, elusive. Two dozen suffragists wore a path from lobby to telephone booths, trying to find where committeemen and men who could reach committeemen, were hidden away. The anti-suffragists quietly interested themselves in the writing room near the telephone booths, and awaited events. If the suffragists were unable to get before the committee there was no occasion for the antis to get excited. If the suffragists succeeded in wearing down the committee to a hearing, why the antis were entitled to come in also. Meantime, the great thing was to keep from being classed as a nuisance.

ANTIS OUTGENERAL THE SUFFRAGISTS.

The suffragists got their hearing, told the committee what they wanted done, and went away rejoicing that there was not even an "anti" in opposition.

The anti-suffragists outgeneraled the suffragists by waiting until the latter had had their say, and then appearing before the committee for the more lasting impression of the last word. Miss Minnie Bronson represented the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage and Miss Frances Benson the New York State Association. They presented a petition to offset that of the suffragists to the effect that

"The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage earnestly urges that your Committee have no illusions concerning the pretty words and promises in the east and threats in the west, but that you stand by the party platform as laid down by the National Convention at St. Louis; and further urges that your Committee stand by the expressed wish of the people of New York State, clearly and emphatically registered at the polls.

"We ask you to remember that the popular vote against woman suffrage in the November election in New York state was 748,332, and that the popular vote for President Wilson, the winning candidate, was 635,475."

Miss Bronson told the evidently sympathetic group that the women politicians claiming 91 electoral votes did not have them to deliver and could not deliver them if they had, as any keen practical politician well knew. The women in the western states are already dividing bitterly between their candidates. The women of the west will not change their family politics at the behest of the women of the East.

In part Miss Bronson said:

"The man who stands for the principles upon which he was nominated will win the support of the people; and not the man who has repudiated his platform to please a few women agitators. Facts are facts, and here they are:

In forty-seven years, woman suffrage has carried in 12 States representing 91 electoral votes. In two years woman suffrage has been defeated in States representing 186 electoral votes.

There are 177 electoral votes from the 15 Democratic States of the Solid South. Only 89 more votes are required to re-elect the President!

There are five States—New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Michigan, representing 116 electoral votes. These, added to the electoral vote of the South are sufficient to re-elect the President with nearly thirty votes to spare. What are the chances of securing these States?

All five States can be considered Democratic. Four of them went Democratic in 1912, and Michigan has gone Democratic since (1914) by more than two to one. These five States have all defeated woman suffrage at the polls since the last Presidential election. There were 2,011,500 votes polled against woman suffrage, with a majority over the suffrage advocates of 647,000. Four of these States gave an aggregate plurality to President Wilson of 135,000 votes in 1912. No Republican has claimed any of these States for their candidate by any substantial majority. It is apparent, therefore, that the Republican candidate, in declaring for a Federal Amendment, disfranchising these voters on a question which many of them consider as important as who shall be President of the United States, has alienated an element in the electorate possessing five times the power necessary to defeat him and to re-elect President Wilson, who stands for State rights."

FRANCES BENSON.

"The trouble with women in politics is that they do too much spite work," said Agnes Riddle, late member of the Colorado legislature. "Spite work won't get you anywhere. I don't believe in this militant suffrage business anyway. A nagging woman never gets anywhere. The best way to antagonize a man is to nag him."

GEORGIA

Atlanta, Ga., *Constitution.*

AFTER endeavoring to get a hearing before the constitutional amendments committee of the senate for many weeks the advocates of the woman suffrage bill succeeded yesterday afternoon in having the bill set for August 17—one day after the legislature adjourns!

The bill was first reported adversely, but this was objected to by several members of the committee unless the ladies were first given a hearing. So the action of the committee in reporting the bill adversely was reconsidered and a hearing has been granted to the advocates of the bill the day after the legislature adjourns.

"What could be fairer than that?" ask those on the committee who are opposed to women voting.

Albany, Aug. 17.—The Albany Young Men's Literary Society held its first debate Tuesday night on the question of woman suffrage, and the anti-suffragists won. The debaters were: For suffrage, J. B. Lanier and R. D. Duke; against suffrage, J. P. Champion and F. P. Wortman. The next debate will be on the question of removing the State capital to Macon. It will be held next Tuesday night. The debaters will be: Affirmative, W. B. Martin and H. B. Brown; negative, Dr. H. H. Williamson and Lee R. Roper.

A House Divided

WOMAN SUFFRAGE has created an amusing situation in New Jersey. Progressive State Chairman J. A. H. Hopkins has been named as a member of the Wilson campaign committee. Mrs. Hopkins is chairman of the New Jersey branch of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, and as such is doing all in her power to defeat the Democratic party. In a recent editorial, the Newark *News* comments as follows:

Progressive State Chairman Hopkins of New Jersey, whom National Democratic Chairman Vance J. McCormick has named as a member of the Wilson campaign committee, would seem to have a man's-sized job right at home. Mrs. Hopkins, who is as prominent in suffrage politics as her husband has been in Progressive politics, minces no words in letting it be known that she is not for Wilson and that about the best she hopes for him is that he gets beaten good and hard. Moreover, she informs the President that he has aroused "the bitterest opposition of the women voters of the West, who will do their utmost to prevent his re-election." It would seem as though Mr. Hopkins, if he is to justify Mr. McCormick's choice in placing him on the campaign committee, should begin by putting his own household in order. Really

it would not be pleasant for Mr. Hopkins to be pointed at when urging support for Wilson as the man who hadn't enough influence with his own wife to prevent her from putting him in an uncomfortable position.

With regard to Mrs. Hopkins's claim that all the women in the suffrage states will do their utmost to defeat the President, it is worth while to quote the comment of William Allen White, in the Emporia (Kan.) *Gazette*, on a similar assertion made by Anne Martin, chairman of the National Woman's party. Miss Martin had said in effect that in the event that Wilson refused to come out for a federal suffrage amendment, she would cast the votes of 4,000,000 women against him. To this Mr. White, who lives in a suffrage state and should know what he is talking about, replies:

> "Miss Martin herself should know, and every man does know, that at least 3,999,999 of those women will cast their votes in exactly the opposite way from that pointed out by Miss Martin merely to prove that they have minds of their own."

What Is the Evidence?
(Editorial, Charleston, W. Va., *Mail.*)

"ANTIS and Booze Linked Up Again," is the headline of an article, devoid of evidence to support the charge, sent out from the headquarters of the West Virginia Equal Suffrage League, at Morgantown.

By their persistent circulation of the charge that the anti-suffragist organization is working under the terms of an alliance with the liquor interests, the suffragists show some familiarity with the political methods employed by some of the male tribe of campaign workers.

The charge (which, doubtless, many high-minded suffragists do not themselves believe) has been denied again and again. What, if any, is the foundation of it?

A good many of the women connected with the organized opposition to equal suffrage are those whose names stand especially high in the lists of respectability. Some of them are members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. Others, also, were influential in the fight for prohibition, both in this and other States.

Are these now in league with the liquor interests? It is a monstrous accusation. What is the evidence? This newspaper does not even imply that there is none—although its exhibition would cause a shock to the sensibilities of all who cherish womanhood.

But if there is evidence, by all means let us have it. To repeat the charge without proof is the surest disqualification for citizenship for those advocates of equal suffrage who circulate it.

"Gentle Women in Politics"
(Charleston, W. Va., *Mail.*)

UNDER the ironical heading "Gentle Women in Politics," the West Virginia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has sent the following statement to the *Mail:*

"At the very threshold of this the first campaign in our State for woman suffrage we are shocked and pained at the tactics of some of the suffragists. The *Mail* recently published a labored and disingenuous contribution from one of them unsuccessfully aiming to connect the liquor interests with the women who merely exercise their right to oppose woman suffrage being thrust upon them them by a minority of their sex.

"Practically, if not expressly, admitting she had not a particle of proof, she contents herself with suspicions and inferences, alike unjust and unfounded. She now resurrects this stale slur which long since was denied and laid to rest by the solemn oath of Mrs. Dodge, a woman of the highest national repute and president of our organization. Such methods reflect not upon us but the public will know whom.

"To add to this unfairness a cruel and baseless attack was made by her upon a woman who is a visitor employed by us and an honor to her sex. Then, too, we have a vilifying attack upon the good women of our organization by an imported high priestess of suffrage, one Kate Devereux Blake, who in the Fairmont *West Virginian* exhibits her gentle womanly nature by saying she had 'lost her respect (a terrible blow to us!) for the decency and honor of the anti-suffrage workers in this State and that they were circulating lies, etc.'

"We ask a thinking public, where is the boasted 'uplift' in politics in such methods?

"Gentle women, where is the 'uplift'? Are you trying to prove what Kipling says: 'The female of the species is more deadly than the male'?"

How Women Will Vote
(Chicago, Ill., *Herald.*)

TO the Editor: The political game is indeed becoming serious, yet amusing. Between Roosevelt and the National Woman's Party, the women have been very much delivered. The way they are disposing of our votes is truly a compliment to our intelligence.

I feel justified in saying a word in defense of the women who have formed the habit of thinking for themselves. No professional politician can dictate to us for whom we must vote. The methods used by the National Woman's Party appeal to the small minority, the noisy unthinking few. The majority of women are shocked at the ill-breeding displayed by these self-styled leaders. We object to the hectoring of our President, no matter to what party he may belong. Even a female politician cannot afford to be less than a "womanly woman."

We feel that Mr. Taft was right when he told an undignified audience of suffragists to go home and learn to control themselves, for they could never hope to vote wisely until that lesson had been learned. We, in Illinois, did not gain our suffrage by threats and militant methods. We appealed to reason. Our representatives and governor respected our dignified appeal and granted our rightful demands. Let the women of other states follow our example.

SUSAN G. MCKEOWN.

Blacklist Again

BOTH brands of suffragists are now applying the "blacklist" and the "boycott" as they did in 1914. The so-called "Woman's Party" has resolved to "defeat the Democrats." The National American Woman Suffrage Association is busily engaged in listing candidates for another "blacklist."

In 1914, the Democrats gained in every district where the "Woman's Party"—then the Congressional Union—fought its candidates; and not one of the eighteen men "blacklisted" by the National American Woman Suffrage Association in that year was defeated.

The "blacklist" of 1914 created so much reaction that the suffragists spent much of their time at the national convention at Nashville in denouncing one another for ever getting it up. They even denied that it was a really, truly, "blacklist," and claimed that "the newspapers" applied that terrible term to their innocent attack on eighteen men for not supporting "humanitarian measures" and woman suffrage. As a matter of fact, the original mimeographed bulletin issued by the suffragists to the press contained the word "blacklist." We have a copy on file. But some excuse had to be made by its originators when it failed.

In 1914, they blamed the papers for the naughty word which did the "cause" so much more harm than good.

Now again, they will "blacklist" every candidate who does not repudiate his party platform and misrepresent and disfranchise the people of his district on this question. They will doubtless find another excuse when this "publicity stunt" fails.

These questions are being sent to terrorize candidates of all parties:

"1. Are you in favor of woman suffrage?

"2. If elected, will you vote in congress to submit to the states a federal amendment to enfranchise the women of this country?

"3. If appointed on a committee in whose jurisdiction such an amendment should fall, will you do all in your power to expedite the passage of such a measure?"

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.

Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman's Relation to Government — *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law
Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment — *Stephen H. Olin*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. — *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism — *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each
Celluloid Buttons.....5c.
Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound — *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman — *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot — *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) — *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.
The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adopted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1916

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....